

**REMARKS**

By this amendment, applicants have amended the specification to correct typographical errors and have amended claim 6 to more clearly define the invention. Applicants have added claims 12-23 to define further aspects of the present invention. Claims 16-23 relate to a terminal having the computer program of claims 6-13, respectively.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by the article by Ayers et al entitled "Using Graphic History in Browsing the World Wide Web" in Proc. 4<sup>th</sup> Intl. WWW Conf., Boston, MA, December 1995. Applicants traverse this rejection and request reconsideration thereof.

The rejected claims relate to a method of presenting and managing a history of web pages accessed, and to a computer program embodied on a computer readable medium and executable by a computer for presenting and managing a history of web pages accessed, that, when executed performs the steps of accessing a web page by a user; reducing the size of the accessed web page to a thumbnail snapshot; and displaying the thumbnail snapshot to the user in an area of a screen containing only history information.

The Ayers et al article discloses a browser enhancement named MosaicG. MosaicG is described as a derivative work of NCSA Mosaic version 2.5 which enhances the history-keeping facility of the browser by providing a two-dimensional view of the documents a user has visited in a session. It is intended as an aid in navigating a collection of hypertext documents. By presenting titles, URLs, and thumbnail images of the documents a user has visited in a session, the Graphic History View allows a user to recognize a previously visited document and provides

a way for the user to revisit that document and analyze the structure of a set of hypertext documents. The features of MosaicG are described as follows:

The menu of the MosaicG Document View is identical to the distributed NCSA Mosaic browser, with the addition of one menu item in the "Navigate" menu. The "Graphic History..." menu item opens another window that will display the sequence of documents visited by the associated Document View window. A separate Graphic History view is created for each Document View, each of which displays a different history. The Graphic History View allows the user to display different information as a part of the tree. The user can selectively display document titles, URLs, or a thumbnail image for each node. When the mouse is placed over a node in the tree, the title and URL of the document appears in the two text fields at the bottom of the Graphic History View Window. A user can recall a document in the tree by double-clicking on a node in the Graphic History View window.

According to the present invention, the thumbnail snapshot is displayed to the user in an area of the screen containing only history information. The thumbnail snapshot may be displayed in a toolbar. In contrast, in Ayers et al, it appears an additional menu item, i.e., the "Graphics History ..." menu item, is placed in the browser. The "Graphics History ..." menu item opens another window that will display the sequence of documents visited by the associated Document View window. There is no disclosure that the "Graphic History ..." window is placed in an area of the screen containing only history information. That is, it appears the "Graphic History..." window can use any part or the entire screen as with any other window. Accordingly, the Ayers et al article does not disclose and would not have suggested the presently claimed invention.

Claims 2 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by the article by Ayers et al in view of the article by Hightower et al entitled "Graphical Multiscale Web Histories: A Study of PadPrints" in ACM Hypertext '98 Conference, Pittsburgh, PA, June 20-24, 1998. Applicants traverse this rejection and request reconsideration thereof.

The Examiner has cited the Hightower et al article only for its teaching of adding pages to the hierarchy unless that page is already present in the hierarchy. This aspect of Hightower clearly does not remedy the basic deficiency of Ayers et al noted above. While Hightower shows in Figure 1 the history map to the left of a browser window, it is not clear whether this is the manner in which it is actually displayed in use or whether Figure 1 shows them side by side only for explanation purposes in the article; i.e., it is not clear that the browser companion in Hightower displays the thumbnail snapshot to the user in an area of the screen containing only history information.

Moreover, the Hightower et al article clearly would not have suggested the features set forth in previously presented dependent claims 3-5 and 8-10 and new claims 18-20, i.e., wherein the thumbnail snapshot is displayed to the user in a toolbar. Nor does the Hightower et al article suggest use of the program in a cellular phone, a palm computer or a personal digital assistant (see new claims 12-15, 22 and 23)

Claims 3, 4, 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by the article by Ayers et al in view of US Patent No. 6,188,398 to Collins-Rector et al. Applicants traverse this rejection and request reconsideration thereof.

The Collins-Rector et al patent discloses a method for enabling an interactive video experience utilizing the Internet in which entertainment is combined with advertising to create an enhanced advertising experience. The invention utilizes techniques to deliver demographically targeted advertisements at predetermined times while watching a video. In addition, selectable buttons are maintained in a visible stack, which, when selected, cause a window to be opened containing further

information. In this manner, a user is able to select an object, and obtain more information about the selected object, while the video stream is still playing, as well as make a purchase decision.

The teachings of the Collins-Rector et al patent are inapposite to the teachings of Ayers et al since the Collins-Rector et al patent does not relate to displaying thumbnails of a history of accessed web pages. Accordingly, there would have been no motivation to combine the disparate teachings of Ayers et al and the Collins-Rector et al patent. Moreover, nothing in the Collins-Rector et al patent would have remedied the basic deficiency noted above with respect to Ayers et al. Accordingly, the presently claimed invention is patentable over the proposed combination of documents.

For the foregoing reasons, favorable reconsideration and allowance of all the claims now in the application are requested.

To the extent necessary, applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in the fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to the deposit account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (Case: 0171.38958PX1), and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



Alan E. Schiavelli  
Registration No. 32,087

(703) 312-6600